LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

PROGRAM:

Legislative Oversight

PROGRAM ELEMENT:

PROGRAM MISSION:

To assist the County Council in performing its legislative oversight function by providing accurate information, unbiased analysis, and independent recommendations

COMMUNITY OUTCOMES SUPPORTED:

- Enhance County Council decisionmaking on budget, legislative, and other policy matters
- · Ensure high-value services for tax dollars
- Increase public awareness and confidence in the Council's deliberations and in agency operations

PROGRAM MEASURES	FY01 ACTUAL	FY02 ACTUAL	FY03 ACTUAL	FY04 BUDGET	FY05 CE REC
Outcomes/Results:					
Percentage of key recommendations adopted by the County	NA	NA	NA	TBD	TBD
Council and implemented ^a					
Service Quality:					
Percentage of individuals reporting satisfaction with the quality of	99	93	89	95	95
Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) reports					
Percentage of individuals reporting satisfaction with their working	⁵NA	98	100	95	95
relationship with OLO staff					
Percentage of new Work Program projects completed within one	80	83	75	90	90
month of initial target date ^c					
Efficiency:					
Cost per final report submitted (\$000) ^d	53	49	55	72	66
Percentage of staff time spent on Work Program assignments	82	84	86	85	85
Workload/Outputs:					
Number of final reports submitted to Council	11	12	12	10	11
Number of Council/Committee worksessions staffed	NA	NA	NA	22	24
Inputs:					
Expenditures, excluding independent audit (\$000)	579	582	655	719	730
Independent audit contract (\$000)	215	323	294	282	290
Workyears	7.8	8.0	8.0	8.3	8.0

Notes:

EXPLANATION:

OLO completed 12 projects during FY03. Three were Intensive Budget Reviews, designed specifically to enhance the Council's budget decisionmaking. Topics OLO studied during FY03 included early childhood education; services to persons who are homeless; services to victims and witnesses of crime; emissions from agency vehicle fleets; waste management practices in parks; employee mental health care benefits; facility planning for road construction projects; services for people with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders; Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) transportation budget; MCPS' approach to seeking grant funds; inter-agency coordination of substance abuse prevention programs; and the sign approval and enforcement process. OLO also managed the audits of the County Government and the Volunteer Fire and Rescue Corporations financial statements.

The latest member performance survey from the National Association of Local Government Auditors (NALGA) provides data for comparison with OLO. The NALGA survey* found that respondents spent 74% of available time on direct audit tasks, completed 64% of engagements or projects by the target completion date, and had a cost per audit hour of \$44 in FY02. For comparison, in FY03 OLO spent 86% of available time on Work Program assignments, completed 75% of assignments within one month of the target completion date, and had a cost per project hour of \$41.

PROGRAM PARTNERS IN SUPPORT OF OUTCOMES: County Council and staff, County Government, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Montgomery College, Montgomery County Public Schools, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, other jurisdictions, consultants.

MAJOR RELATED PLANS AND GUIDELINES: Chapter 29A Montgomery County Code; Council Resolution 14-607, FY01 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 14-965, FY02 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 14-1395, FY03 Work Program for OLO; Council Resolution 15-281, FY04 Work Program for OLO.

^aIn FY04, the Office of Legislative Oversight (OLO) plans to develop a system to track the implementation of key recommendations endorsed by the County Council.

^bThe FY01 survey by OLO did not assess satisfaction with the working relationship with OLO staff.

^cOLO identifies target completion dates when the Council adopts the annual OLO Work Program. The target is an estimate based on information available at the beginning of the fiscal year. A number of outside factors affect project completion dates, such as other OLO projects or priorities and cooperation from other agencies and jurisdictions.

^dThese figures include all OLO personnel and operating expenditures, excluding the cost of the independent audit. The cost per final report submitted varies significantly from year to year, depending on the number and complexity of the projects assigned.

^{*}National Association of Local Government Auditors, "Report on NALGA's Benchmarking and Best Practices Survey for Fiscal Year 2002," October 2002.